

**BIGFORK LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Approved Minutes Thursday May 28, 2020**  
**Meeting was conducted through Zoom Teleconference**

Chairwoman Susan Johnson called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

**Present:** Committee member attendees: Susan Johnson, Chany Ockert, Richard Michaud, Lou McGuire, Jerry Sorensen, and Shelley Gonzales; Public: 11 members; Flathead Planning and Zoning: Erick Mack and Donna Valade.

The agenda was approved (m/s, J. Sorensen/R. Michaud), unanimous.

Minutes of the March 26, 2020 meeting were approved (m/s, R. Michaud/C. Ockert), unanimous.

**Administrator's Report and Announcements:**

For this meeting there was electronic sign in via Zoom. Approved minutes and documents are posted on the County website: [flathead.mt.gov/planning\\_zoning](http://flathead.mt.gov/planning_zoning). Click on [meeting information](#).

**Public Comment:**

None

**Application:**

**FCU-20-01:** A request by Ranger Springs Inc., for a conditional use permit to operate a Camp and Retreat Center to allow for a community accessible farm for people to engage in farm chores and activities on property located at 6810 and 6840 Highway 35 within the Bigfork Zoning District.

**Staff Report:**

Erik Mack presented the staff report. The application is before BLUAC due to an error in the initial report. Not all adjacent property owners were notified of the applicant's request for a Conditional Use Permit. Also, the revised staff report states the subject property acreage at 156 acres and that is an error. The actual acreage is 470 acres, as stated in the original staff report. Also, in the original staff report staff calculated the maximum parking allowed of 6,500 vehicles based on all 470 acres which includes significant agricultural land. The intent was not to say there would be parking for 6,500 vehicles, but the intent is for parking for 600-650 vehicles.

Since the first staff report, the department has received from the public 30 emails/ letters of concern regarding the application. Concerns are: there are no restrictions on size of events permitted; allowance of 6,500 vehicles could generate 30,000 people on the property; the applicant did not take into consideration the transfer of this property to a successor who might host high-impact events; once the permit is issued the neighbors would lose oversight regarding large events; the neighbors want a limit on size and number of large events and number of daily events; the neighbors are concerned about traffic, noise and vibration; the neighbors questioned how the conditions added by BLUAC would limit size and number of large events. Erik proposed a condition that would limit the size and number of events for BLUAC to consider; the neighbors questioned environmental constraints to protect water, wetlands, wildlife, and air; the neighbors are concerned about changes to the access points to the property. Erik stated that primary access is off Highway 35 and farming access points would be used by staff; the neighbors would like to see events end by 9-9:30 p.m.

Since the second staff report, the department has received two emails concerning the application. The concerns are entrances, noise, traffic, road maintenance, notification of all events to the surrounding property owners, and security measures to insure a low risk of trespassing and vandalism.

Erik stated that he added Condition #16 to the staff report to address traffic control and provide support from state and local agencies.

Q. Johnson: How many access points are there off Highway 35 to the subject property? A. Mack: That would be a better question for the applicant.

### **Applicant Report:**

Doug Averill and Reed Darrow presented the applicant report. Doug stated that Erick made ten points in his presentation, all but one related to large events. A map of the property was presented. There are 8 access points on the property, 3 paved from Highway 35, two from Riverside Dr., one from No. Ramsfield, 2 from Ramsfield, and one from the Johnson's property.

Reed Darrow stated that he is the owner of Ranger Springs, Inc. Historically the property has been in agriculture and he wants to maintain that and add agricultural-based historical events. The intent is to try and find a way to develop the property's economic value with ag-based events and not sell it off for development.

Doug Averill's presentation was to correct misinformation from multiple sources regarding the application and expand on the vision for the property. He referenced a letter he sent to the neighbors of Ranger Springs Farm/Ranch dated May 26, 2020. Issues raised in the letter are as follows:

1. The application requested 600 parking spaces not 6,500, as stated in the staff report. It was construed that parking of that magnitude would draw 32,000 people.
2. The second staff report reduced the acreage of the project from 470 to 156 acres and staff did not contact the applicant about that change.
3. Bigfork Rodeo is not moving to the Ranger Springs property. Bigfork Rodeo has a 10-year agreement to use its current space.
4. It has been suggested that Ranger Springs pave Ramsfield Road. The property has 3 paved entrances that are the primary access for the public.
5. A misconception at the first BLUAC meeting was regarding the Paladin Charitable Foundation and conditions added by BLUAC added to the public misinformation.
6. Noise concerns are addressed by ending programs by 9:30 p.m. Secluded areas on the property will mitigate noise.
7. Large public events are not necessarily problematic. Large events at Flathead Lake Lodge have attracted a total of 58,000 people over many years and generated \$57 million for the local economy. There have been no complaints from surrounding neighbors.
8. Public concern that water quality in the creek and wetlands would be impacted are unfounded. Water quality has been improved with the removal of cattle in the area.
9. The only new building proposed for the property is a greenhouse.
10. Concern that there will be people trespassing on private property is unwarranted.
11. Agriculture function cannot maintain this property.
12. Ranger Springs' purpose is to preserve this historic farm and farm equipment, provide youth related farm activities for children of all needs, provide activities that support agriculture and develop equestrian skills. There is no massive event center planned.

Q. Sorensen: Where are you with the neighbors' concerns? A. Averill: I have sent a more detailed letter to them explaining the purpose of the project, including small events consisting of 500 attendees and two events per year of 3,000 people. I think the neighbors feel better knowing there will not be 30,000 people on the property.

Q. Ockert: Condition #17 of the staff report limits the number of people allowed per day for activities that are non-profit generating events for the charity. Is that condition not applicable? A. Averill: The charitable foundation has nothing to do with Ranger Springs. All income from events will restore the property, barn, and infrastructure.

Q. Michaud: You stated that 1,500 people on a large event is too low and it needs to be 3,000, but at the last meeting you stated that the rodeo could move there with 6,000 attending. The numbers are inconsistent. A. Averill: At the last BLUAC meeting it was suggested to limit the number at an event to 1,500 people based on attendance of 1,000 people at the rodeo. That analysis was wrong as there were 2,000/per day at the rodeo and the rodeo was a 3-day event. I suggest that Ranger Springs be limited to a total of 3,000 people whether it is a 1, 2, or 3-day event.

Q. Gonzales: I thought BLUAC proposed 1,500 per day per event, so I think we in agreement. A. Averill: Are you saying 1,500 per day and 4,500 for three days, because I am fine with that. I suggest you might want to propose a one-day option versus a three-day option. A larger one-day event has less impact than a three-day event.

Q. Michaud: But that would limit you to your 3-day events, correct? Or would that give you 90,000+ people at 4,500 per day? A. Averill: No, that is 4,500 for one of the two events per year.

Q. Michaud: So that would be single day events? A. Averill: I propose either 3 1,500 people day events or one 4,500 people event. If people complain, the events get shut down. It is difficult to operate with predetermined numbers.

Q. McGuire: In our conditions at the last meeting we had the applicants mixed up, but is there any resistance by the correct property owner to have the CUP expire when the land is no longer owned by them? A. Averill: The plan is to pass this property on to the next Averill and Darrow generations. The Averill family has first right of refusal to purchase the property from the Darrow family.

Q. McGuire: What happens if you or your generations of family no long wants the property? Can we end the CUP? A. Averill: It probably could, but it probably is not in the best interest to allow the property to be divided into residential and commercial development. It will take personal investment to protect this property.

Q. McGuire: In the prior review, BLUAC added Condition #17 to terminate the CUP if Paladin Conservancy transferred title to the property to any other owner. Now that we know that Ranger Springs is the property owner, will you have any issue with having the same restriction to terminate the CUP upon transfer of title to any other owner? A. Averill: That does not bother me a bit.

Q. Michaud: Regarding large events, can we stipulate that they are ag related and not BMX races or motocross? A. Averill: There are non-ag events that will not

have environmental impacts but bring large economic returns (cited half marathon in Browning).

Q. Michaud: I know how much money can be generated by BMX/Motocross/Rock concert events. A. Averill: We will not have those types of events. This is not what our application is about.

### **Public Agency Comments:**

Julie Spencer of Bigfork Water and Sewer stated that in the upper right quadrant of the map is the water supply for Bigfork. Event planners must know that there cannot be contamination there, and it would impact our water supply if there were any subdivisions. The property is out of our district, but it is next to where Bigfork's water originates. Julie pointed to where the wells are located. Averill added to Spencer's comments; there will be no hydro-electric generator plant installed in the waterfall on the property, as public has rumored. Erik Mack added that Doug's comments need to be stated as a reply in the Public Comment/Staff/Applicant reply section, per Robert's Rules of Order.

### **Public Comments:**

Jill Stuart – There were 40 property owners surrounding the Ranger Springs property that participated in the letter writing to Planning and Zoning. We were not misinformed, and we did not reach our conclusion based on inaccurate information. She stated at the last BLUAC meeting their concerns were not addressed as there were issues with muting in the Zoom program. We do not feel Doug has addressed the issue of large events. We want large events quantified and limited to events of over 500 people and less than 1500 people. Events under 500 people can be as many as they want. There needs to be a limit on nuisance noise and dust. We have property rights and want to enjoy our property. There needs to be traffic studies for traffic mitigation. She questions who gets the CUP and asks that it is non-transferable.

Robin Jenkins – How much teeth do these CUPs have?

Melisa Jenkins – How will noise be monitored and mitigated. How will traffic ingress and egress to the property be managed from Highway 35?

Rey Johnson – Will the CUP be reviewed periodically? How will the county/applicant keep the community involved?

Edie Sellars – I like the idea of the plan and I feel the neighbors have compromised on their economic concerns and the applicant's economic goals. Keeping events between 500 and 1,500 people is reasonable.

Tricia Pollett – We were not notified at the initial application (property on east side of Highway 35). What are the limits Doug is proposing regarding size, time, and number of events? What would he agree to? He states nothing will happen for the

next two years, what will happen after that? In my opinion one large day event is more of an impact than three smaller consecutive events. Events in secluded areas does not mean noise buffering. There is a need for traffic control for large events. I am concerned about accidents at access points if there is a traffic back up.  
Brent Pomeroy – I am concerned about the size and duration of events and limiting the number per year.

**Staff Reply:**

Erik referenced BLUAC minutes from the March 26<sup>th</sup> meeting on size and number of events was not conditioned. Equestrian events are a permitted use with the AG-40 zoning, so no CUP is required.

R. Jenkins reply: The staff report lists 18 conditions that the applicant must meet before operations start. If the applicant violates a condition, for example more events than are permitted, then a person can file complaint with Planning and Zoning. The compliance officer would investigate and if a violation occurred that the applicant does not remedy, the CUP could be revoked.

Johnson reply: An annual review of a CUP with inspections is not typically done. The CUP is tied to the property and would transfer to another owner of the property. BLUAC and the Board of Adjustment could condition the CUP with a requirement for an annual inspection or new permit every year, but it is not typically done. There is no noise ordinance in Flathead county however, noise could be mitigated by limiting the of hours of operation, example 9:30 p.m.

M. Jenkins reply: Regarding traffic, for larger events there is a condition where the applicant would have to contact MDT, Sheriff's department and the county Road and Bridge department for proper traffic control. BLUAC and the Board of Adjustment could condition the CUP to restrict the use of farm access roads for large events.

**Applicant Reply:**

Doug stated that he appreciated the public input. He addressed the public comments as follows:

Stuart reply: I believe we have already agreed to limit large events to between 500 and 1,500 people. Regarding a traffic study, the traffic we will generate is a fraction of 1% and I doubt MDT would do a study based on the small percentage increase. Regarding the CUP, Reed and I are fine with the permit staying with the Averill and Darrow families.

Johnson reply: Regarding a periodic review of the CUP, I think it would take a statute change in the county's planning regulations to do that. But if someone at the county level wanted to investigate that I suppose it could be done.

Sellers reply: I believe we have already agreed that 500 to 1,500 people is reasonable. We are improving our property, so it adds value to yours and ours.  
Pollett reply: Limiting large events to 2 per year is fine. We think it will take 2 years before the property is presentable and up and running for the public. We have been setback by 2 years due to COVID and the economy.

As a general comment to the public comments, Doug asked, have you thought about the alternative? If we do not step in and make something happen with this property, think about what could happen with this property. We know how to manage events to mitigate noise. This property has an abundance of accesses, but it does not mean they will be used. The neighbors can petition MDT to lower the speed limit in the area.

### **Committee Discussion:**

Johnson stated that a lot of the public concerns were met by the applicant. Condition #17 was discussed regarding whether the CUP should be tied to the existing corporate entity/future corporate entity or the land. Ockert moved to delete Condition #17, second by Johnson, approved unanimously.

Condition #8 is amended as follows: The applicant shall contact the Montana Department of Transportation to determine if an updated approach permit must be obtained applicable to camp/retreat center **or scheduled events.**(added) The remainder of the condition is unchanged, m/s Ockert/McGuire, approved unanimously.

Condition #15 is deleted in its entirety and is replaced as follows: The applicant shall limit large events to 2 per year. A large event shall consist of an event drawing more than 500 attendees but not more than 4,500 over a maximum 3-day period, m/s Sorensen/McGuire, approved unanimously

Condition #18 is now Condition #17, and amended as follows: At the end of **each** (added) 12 months from the date of authorization of this permit, staff will inspect to verify compliance (FCZR Section 2.06.060), m/s Johnson/McGuire, approved unanimously.

### **Findings of Fact:**

Ockert moved to amend Findings of Fact #1 and #5 to replace 156 acres with 470 acres, second McGuire, approved unanimously.

Ockert moved to amend Findings of Fact #10 to remove “over 1500 people” at the end of the final sentence, second McGuire, approved unanimously.

Michaud moved to delete Findings of Fact #13 in its entirety and replace it with “The hours of operation could have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood therefore, events shall end by 9:30 p.m., second Sorensen, approved unanimously.

McGuire moved to adopt the Findings of Fact with #1, #5, #10 and #13, as amended, second Sorensen, approved unanimously.

**Committee Discussion and Vote:** Sorensen moved to forward a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to approve FCU-20-01 subject to the Conditions, as approved. Motion was seconded by Ockert, motion passed unanimously. The Board of Adjustment will hear FCU -20-01 on Tuesday June 2, 2020 at 6 p.m. remotely via WebEx. Call Planning and Zoning at 751-8200 for instructions on how to access WebEx for this meeting.

**Application:**

**FZC-20-07:** A zone change and a neighborhood plan amendment request by Tyler and Keturah Kerst for property in the Bigfork Zoning District. The proposal would change the zoning on property located at 25 Echo Bay Trail in Bigfork, MT from AG-20 (Agricultural) to SAG-10 (Suburban Agricultural). The total acreage involved in the request is 22.09.

**Staff Report:**

Erik Mack presented the staff report. There have been no public comments on this application but there are three agency comments.

Creston Fire Department reported no significant impact, but encouraged adequate, visible road signs and that the owners adhere to fire suppression guidelines.

In the area is AG-20 zoning, to the north it is unzoned, to the west is SAG-5 and SAG-10 which has similar usage as SAG-5.

Q. Johnson: Finding of Fact #1 states the proposed amendment is from SAG-10 to SAG-5, that appears incorrect. A. Mack: Yes, that is a typo and it should be AG-20 to SAG-10. (The error will be corrected for the Planning Board meeting.)

Q. Johnson: The report references a gravel road. Is it wide enough to accommodate emergency vehicles? A. Mack: The road is built to county width standards.

Q. McGuire: Page 11 (c), the first paragraph states there is a 30-foot easement included within a 60-foot easement, how does that work? Mack: The 30-foot easement reference should be deleted.



**Applicant Report:**

Tyler Kerst stated that there are 7 easements within Echo Bay Road/Echo Bay Trail/Belterra. Echo Bay Trail is a paved road. The property easement is 30-feet, then past the subject property the easement widens to 60-feet to access separate properties.

Erik stated he would clarify the easements and that Echo Bay Trail is paved with the Planning Board.

**Public Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Comments:**

None

**Staff Reply:**

None

**Applicant Reply:**

None

**Committee Discussion:**

None

**Findings of Fact:**

McGuire moved to correct the typo error in Finding of Fact #1 to read change from AG-20 to SAG-10, second Johnson, passed unanimously. Sorensen moved to adopt Findings of Fact, as amended in #1, second Ockert, passed unanimously.

**Committee Discussion and Vote:**

McGuire moved to forward to the Planning Board a recommendation to approve FZC-20-07, second by Ockert. There was no further committee discussion and the motion was passed unanimously.

The Planning Board will consider FZC-20-07 on June 10, 2020, 6 p.m., at the Flathead County Fair Grounds.

**Application: FPP-20-05:** A request from Sands Surveying, Inc., on behalf of Richard & Nancy Whitaker and Tim & Sherrie Calaway for preliminary plat approval of The Fort, a proposal to create 14 new commercial lots on 10.003 acres.

The proposal would be served by the Bigfork Water and Sewer District. The property is located at 135 Montana Highway 83.

**Staff Report:**

Donna Valade presented the staff report for a preliminary plat approval of The Fort, a 14-lot commercial subdivision. Access will be via the green box access road. There will be internal access roads and at completion there will be an additional access road on to Highway 83. Lots will range from 0.32 acres to 1.79 acres and the property is zoned B-3. Agency comments include: Environmental Health Department stated the subdivision is subject to review under the Subdivision and Sanitation Act; Montana Department of Transportation requires a new approach permit and will analyze if traffic mitigation measures are required; Bigfork Water and Sewer has issued a “will serve” letter. There has been no public comment.

Q. Ockert: The Environment Assessment Report states there will be an event center and pickleball courts, but the traffic report does not take an event center into its analysis. Does the traffic report need to be rewritten based on the addition of an event center/pickleball courts? A. Valade: I believe they will have to go through a different process to get the approaches approved with the addition of an event center/pickleball courts. The applicant can address that question.

Q. Gonzales: With the addition of an event center the trips per day analysis in the staff report is inaccurate. A. Valade: That is a question for the applicant.

Q. Sorensen: This area has the greatest traffic congestion in Bigfork. There needs to be a left turn lane into the development. With no idea the amount of traffic this development will generate, is anyone looking at this? A. Valade: As planners we are always looking at traffic. It is MDT who evaluates approach permits and they will be considering an updated approach permit for the green box site. After the update, MDT will evaluate the traffic and propose recommendations and solutions.

Q. Sorensen: Can P&Z do anything to have the state look at this traffic problem as this area is already a really bad situation and it will turn into a disaster? A.

Valade: Other areas in the county are facing similar problems.

Comment by Gonzales: I have commented on the traffic problem at each application for development in this area and nothing is done. Bigfork needs to begin a letter writing campaign to MDT because the county will not do anything about the problem.

Comment by Johnson: On page 11 of the staff report James Freyholtz of MDOT states that both approaches need a Systems Impact Review with the MDOT Helena office. This review should be done before the project proceeds with an event center/pickleball courts.

**Applicant Report:**

Tim Calaway hired a firm for a traffic impact study, and he is in favor of a left turn lane. He gave the county an easement for access to the green boxes and the county assured him that they would address any traffic problems at that access point. He stated his development would add only one-tenth of the number of vehicles that use the green box site. MDOT needs to approve the impact study.

Eric Mulcahy, consultant, stated that the subdivision will be subject to the Systems Impact Review as stated by James Freyholtz of MDOT. B-3 zoning provides for a variety of uses. The pickle ball courts were used as analysis for highest use of water and sewer, daily traffic use would be minimal. MDOT will dictate if a left turn lane to the subdivision is required.

Comment Sorensen: Speeding is an issue in that area, drivers do not use turn signals, congestion from the gas station, apartments, and green boxes, and at the height of summer, this is a congested mess.

Q. Ockert: As B-3 zoning allows for mixed use including residential, and the CC&Rs state there is a residential component, how will residential housing be implemented? A. Calaway: With a pickleball center I would build townhouses for rental via VRBO/Air BnB for pickleball tournaments.

Q. Ockert: As there would be 10-12 commercial businesses, would you encourage businesses to have upstairs apartments to help with the shortage of employee housing? A. Calaway: Some housing is possible.

Q. Ockert: Will you encourage employee housing in your CC&Rs? A. Calaway: Sure.

Q. Johnson: How many cars can be parked on Lot 2 if used for pickleball? A. Mulcahy: We are looking at a subdivision with many possibilities. The pickleball court could be a going concern or a recreational outlet for the people of Bigfork. There is no definite plan for what will be developed.

Q. McGuire: What is our standard for approving a preliminary plat? Will BLUAC get to weigh in on the final approval? A. Valade: BLUAC will not consider final approval. The final subdivision will go directly to the commissioners.

Q. Gonzales: We have been told that BLUAC would review the final plat, is that not the case. A. Valade: It is not the case. The planner reviews the conditions and if all are met it goes directly to the commissioners. Mulcahy added that if the developer cannot comply with the conditions, then BLUAC and the Planning Board would re-review an amended application.

Q. Gonzales: In Finding of Fact #9, it states the soils are not acceptable for commercial development and the county is not in the position to maintain the property. A. Valade: Options for land use, besides farming, must be looked at. Comment Sorensen: We need to modify that Finding of Fact.

**Public Agency Comments:**

Julie Spencer of Bigfork Water and Sewer stated that commercial development of this area has been anticipated and it should not be an issue for the district.

**Public Comments:**

None

**Staff Reply:**

None

**Applicant Reply:**

None

**Committee Discussion:**

Johnson is also concerned about the traffic flow on Highway 83; it is an accident waiting to happen. Finding of Fact #4 needs to be amended as the road access does not appear to be adequate. The committee discussed and staff added that both accesses will be reviewed and must comply to obtain the updated approach permits. Sorensen stated that the project makes sense, the Highway 83/35 is a bad intersection and this project will only make it worse. Gonzales stated the speed limit through that area is 70mph, and that the storage unit development is only in the first of five phases; consider the increased traffic at full buildout. McGuire added that issue is not the developer's problem it is the problem of the MDOT and the county. Gonzales asked that the developer get the MDOT to reduce the speed limit to 45mph from Shawnee Drive to the Highway 83/35 intersection. McGuire added that the developer needs to have the county pay for a third lane based upon the county stating that they would take care of any traffic problems.

**Findings of Fact:**

Finding of Fact #4: Johnson moved to delete Finding of Fact #4 and replace it with the following:

“The road system access points do not appear to be adequate based on MDOT recommendations. The western approach into the subdivision is in place and serves the county green box site, a mini storage, and the subdivision from Hwy 83 and the eastern access is just an agricultural approach from Hwy 83. Both approaches will need to go through the System Impact Review with the MDOT Helena office.” Motion was seconded by McGuire and passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact #9: There was a discussion regarding the statement in the staff report that the subject subdivision's soils were not adequate for commercial development. The land is identified for commercial development in the Bigfork Land Use Map and the land is zone for commercial development. McGuire moved to delete Finding of Fact #9, seconded Sorensen, motion failed due to lack of a majority (aye: Sorensen, Michaud, McGuire/nay: Ockert, Gonzales, Johnson).

Finding of Fact #17: Johnson moved to delete Finding of Fact #17 and replace it with the following:

"No variances are requested or required. The proposed subdivision is in general compliance with Flathead County Subdivision Regulations, effective December 3, 2018. If compliant, legal and physical access will be provided and potential impacts to the primary review criteria will be adequately addressed by MDOT." Motion was seconded by McGuire and passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact #20. The finding is redundant to #17. McGuire moved to delete Finding of Fact #20, seconded by Sorensen, passed unanimously.

Sorensen moved and Gonzales seconded to adopt the Findings of Facts, with # 4, 17 and 20, as amended. McGuire stated she would vote no to adopting the Findings of Facts based on the inclusion of #9. The motion passed (aye: Johnson, Michaud, Sorensen, Ockert and Gonzales, nay: McGuire).

Condition #18 was added as follows:

"This proposal will require the applicant to submit new approach permits for 2 access points to the subdivision and comply with conditions imposed by the Systems Impact Review from the MDOT Helena office".

Moved by Gonzales, seconded by Johnson, passed unanimously.

Condition #19 was added as follows:

"Applicant shall provide to MDOT the comments of BLUAC to the effect that there is a dangerous highway condition in this area which must be remediated."

Moved by Ockert, seconded by Johnson, passed unanimously.

### **Committee Discussion and Vote:**

Ockert stated that the developer has the power in the CC&Rs to encourage residential development. Given that more commercial development will exacerbate the housing shortage problem, she hopes the developer will add a residential component to the CC&Rs. Johnson stated that if they say yes, it still might not happen.

Sorensen moved to forward to the Planning Board a recommendation to approve FPP-20-05, seconded by Ockert. Gonzales commented that the committee put more conditions on the application but she is not comfortable with the density at that area with the apartments, park and ride at the church, existing businesses, and there is not enough conditions to support the application. The vote was a tie (aye: Sorensen, Michaud, Ockert/nay: Johnson, Gonzales, McGuire), therefore, BLUAC forwards no recommendation on FPP-20-5.

The Planning Board will consider FPP-20-5 on June 10, 2020, 6 p.m., at the Flathead County Fair Grounds.

**Old Business:**

None

**New Business:**

Election of officers: chair Susan Johnson, vice chair Jerry Sorensen and Richard Michaud as the Member-at-Large. Moved by Gonzales, seconded McGuire, passed unanimously.

**Adjourn:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Shelley Gonzales, member, and acting secretary